

## **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, May 10, 2011**

### **Meeting Minutes**

The Development Review Committee of Monroe County conducted a meeting on **Tuesday, May 10, 2011**, beginning at 10:05 a.m. at the Marathon Government Center, Conference Room (2nd floor), 2798 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL** by Gail Creech

### **DRC MEMBERS:**

Townsley Schwab, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources	Present
Mike Roberts, Senior Administrator, Environmental Resources	Present
Joe Haberman, Development Review Manager	Present

### **STAFF MEMBERS:**

Mitch Harvey, Comprehensive Plan Manager	Present
Rey Ortiz, Planner	Present
Gail Creech, Planning Commission Coordinator	Present

### **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Ms. Creech added the minutes from the April 26, 2011 meeting for approval.

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Townsley Schwab approved the minutes from the meetings of June 22, 2010, March 29, 2011 and April 26, 2011.

### **MEETING**

#### **NEW ITEMS:**

**1. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS** AMENDING MONROE COUNTY CODE SECTION 114-67, REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING; PROVIDING A NEW MINIMUM PARKING STANDARD FOR MULTIFAMILY UNITS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS AND THE

SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Mr. Ortiz presented the staff report. The Planning and Environmental Resources Department is looking at a way to require more parking spaces through either the square footage or the number of bedrooms for the units, as well as a provision to allow guest parking spaces to be included in the calculations. Staff applied Section 114-67, multifamily dwelling units, to the singular item, 1.5 spaces for one- or two-bedroom units, then 1.75 spaces for three-bedroom units, and each dwelling unit providing a one-fourth guest parking space.

Mr. Roberts questioned the effect this would have on the landscaping requirements. Mr. Haberman answered it would not have an effect in a residential district, but in an SC district it would require more parking, which in turn will require more parking lot landscaping. Mr. Haberman commented that this issue could be oversimplified or left as is, which is a little bit complex to calculate, and requested the Committee members' thoughts on that issue. There has been no community input as of yet.

Mr. Ortiz' estimate of the cost of each additional parking space of \$10,000 was discussed. Mr. Haberman admitted that the direction to look into this issue was as a result of the community comments regarding recent project developments. Mr. Haberman proposed making every unit two spaces, as most American families, rich or poor, have two cars. Mr. Roberts suggested that as the number of required spaces is expanding, that the landscaping requirements be tied to the actual use, not to the specific zoning, and suggested looking at the storm water issue as well. Mr. Haberman explained that the direction has been not to go beyond this section of the code. Mr. Schwab added that the landscaping ordinance is something that must be addressed and updated in the future.

Mr. Schwab questioned how this proposal would affect the number of spaces at the Blue Water project. Mr. Haberman answered that the proposal would not be made to be retroactive, but it will make that site instantly nonconforming to the current code. If Blue Water had applied the proposed parking standards, it would result in an increase of approximately 20 more spaces. Mr. Harvey stated that he felt that the ultimate impact of this proposal would be a reduction in density in order to meet the new parking standard.

Mr. Haberman suggested that Mr. Ortiz use the Habitat for Humanity project in Big Coppitt Key as an example before the Planning Commission since there have been complaints and newspaper articles run about the parking situation there. Mr. Schwab agreed that staff needs to proceed before the Planning Commission with a tangible indication from three different projects of how these proposals would affect projects done in the past. Mr. Haberman also suggested defining what a bedroom is. Mr. Schwab stated that the number one goal is to get the parking standards in line with what the needs are, and the secondary impacts will be dealt with later.

**2.Long Dock Variance for John Lombardi, Key Largo** approving an application for a pier type dock extending 175 feet beyond Mean High Water (MHW) and 115 feet beyond Mean Low Water (MLW). The requested variance is necessary to reach the required water depth of -4' MLW. The property is located at 112 North Bounty Lane, Key Largo and is legally described as

BK 3 LT 46 BUCCANEER POINT SUBDIVISION PB7-6 KEY LARGO OR787-450 OR963-209 OR 1569-1289 OR2435-1033D/C OR2435-1040/43; **RE # 00496131-009000.**

Mr. Roberts stated that he has two long dock variances on the agenda to run by the Committee to make sure that nobody wants to revise anything as far as the approval process is concerned, which currently requires approval by the Director of Planning for a dock over 100 feet, as well as production of a technical document. Mr. Roberts added that the biggest challenge is the community character clause. The standards are based on the square footage and the actual resource impact. These are administrative approvals that don't require Planning Commission approval unless appealed.

Mr. Haberman voiced his concern of letting people go beyond the minimum length necessary without requiring justification that they are only doing what they need to do to get out there for navigation purposes. Mr. Roberts stated that the code already restricts the dock length to the minimum necessary to reach navigable depth or avoid impacts to resources. The Lombardis were required by the Department of Environmental Protection to go to five feet mean low water, as opposed to four feet, because of the sea grass.

**3.Long Dock Variance for William and Renata Hoffman, Summerland Key** approving an application for a pier type dock extending 528 feet, 353 feet beyond Mean Low Water (MLW). The requested variance is necessary to reach the required water depth of -4' MLW. The property is located at 1525 Niles Road, Summerland Key and is legally described as 23 66 28 SUMMERLAND KEYS PT LOT 2 AND PT LOT 7 (TRACT FFF) OR 567-541-545Q OR 669-834-840 OR744-797-803 OR790-1274-1275 OR1060-2069 OR1196-2018AFF OR1271-1188C/T OR1733-1495 OR2046-668 OR2370-284/86C/T OR2406-2346/47C OR2411-1819/2; **RE # 00114470-005800.**

Mr. Roberts explained that this is in an area with a very shallow approach and the 528 ½ feet is the very minimum the applicant needs to get to four feet mean low water. Mr. Haberman added that allowing a long dock variance is a better idea than the homeowners destroying resources in the area. Mr. Schwab stated that bringing these variances before the DRC was not necessary, and the standard procedure should be followed. Mr. Haberman suggested having the County biologist confirm that there is a principal use that would be served by the dock so that a variance application and fee is not accepted when the end product cannot be approved. Mr. Roberts suggested amending the code to include wording that one would not be able to construct on the variance until one goes in for a permit for the primary development.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Monroe County Development Review Committee meeting was adjourned at 10:44 a.m.